

<b>TO:</b>  <b>Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks</b> <b>Washington, D.C. 20231</b>	<b>REPORT ON THE</b> <b>FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN</b> <b>ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR</b> <b>TRADEMARK</b>
--	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Western Dist of MI on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. 1:98-cv-127	DATE FILED February 10, 1998	U.S. DISTRICT COURT Western District of Michigan
PLAINTIFF  DONNELLY CORPORATION		DEFENDANT  BRITAX RAINSFORDS INC. d/b/a BRITAX VISION SYSTEMS (NORTH AMERICA) INC.
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 <i>5,374,639</i>		
2		SEE ATTACHED COMPLAINT
3		
4		<b>SOLICITOR</b>
5		<b>FEB 18 1998</b>

In the above-entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

**U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE**

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading		
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

In the above-entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgment issued:

DECISION/JUDGMENT
-------------------

CLERK  RONALD C WESTON, SR.	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK <i>L. Dack</i>	DATE  FEB 13 1998
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

FILED - GR

FEB 10 PM 3:39

RONALD WESTON, SR., CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

COPY

1:98CV127

DONNELLY CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

Case No.

vs.

BRITAX RAINSFORDS INC., d/b/a  
BRITAX VISION SYSTEMS  
(NORTH AMERICA) INC.

Defendant.

David W. McKeague  
U. S. District Judge

COMPLAINT

For its Complaint herein, plaintiff Donnelly Corporation avers as follows:

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 35 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c) and 1400(b).

2. Plaintiff, Donnelly Corporation ("Donnelly"), is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Michigan, having its principal place of business at 414 East Fortieth Street, Holland, Michigan 49423, within the Western District of Michigan.

3. Defendant, Britax Rainsfords Inc., d/b/a Britax Vision Systems (North America) Inc. ("Britax") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Michigan, having a place of business at 1855 Busha Highway, Marysville, Michigan 48040. On information and belief, Britax is doing business within the Western District of Michigan.

4. On December 6, 1994, United States Letters Patent No. 5,371,659 (the “’659 patent”) entitled “Remote-Actuated Exterior Vehicle Security Light” was duly and legally issued to Donnelly as assignee of the inventors, Todd W. Pastrick, Linda K. Molencamp and Roger L. Koops. Since that time, Donnelly has been and still is the sole owner of the ’659 patent and of the right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. A true copy of the ’659 patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

5. Britax has made, used, sold and offered for sale to customers, including at least Ford Motor Company, rearview mirrors incorporating remote-actuated exterior vehicle security lights. These acts, sales, and offers for sale are without right, license or permission from Donnelly.

6. By the acts, sale and offers for sale referred to in paragraph 5, Britax has infringed, contributorily infringed, and induced others to infringe the ’659 patent. Upon information and belief, these infringing activities have been willful and will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

7. Donnelly has been damaged by Britax’s infringement, contributory infringement and inducement of infringement of the ’659 patent, and will be irreparably harmed if these infringing activities are not enjoined. Donnelly does not have an adequate remedy at law.

8. Donnelly has marked its products which are intended for use in practicing the invention of the ’659 patent in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 287(a).

9. This is an exceptional case, and Donnelly is entitled to an award of costs, reasonable attorneys’ fees and three times its actual damages.

WHEREFORE, Donnelly prays for judgment that:

A. Donnelly is the sole owner of the '659 patent and of the right to recover for any and all infringement thereof;

B. Britax has infringed, contributorily infringed and induced infringement of the '659 patent, and that these infringing activities have been willful;

C. Britax, its officers, agents, servants and employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from further infringement, contributory infringement or inducement of infringement of the '659 patent;

D. Donnelly be awarded its damages caused by the infringing activities of Britax, and the damages so ascertained be trebled and awarded to Donnelly together with interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees; and

E. Donnelly be awarded such further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Donnelly hereby demands trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 10, 1998

GRUEL, MILLS, NIMS & PYLMAN LLP  
Attorneys for Donnelly Corporation

By: 

Grant J. Gruel P14443  
Thomas R. Behm P40073  
50 Monroe Place, Suite 700 West  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
616/235-5500

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
Of Counsel for Donnelly Corporation

By: 

John A. O'Brien  
Nicholas Groombridge  
277 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10172  
212/758-2400